

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Initially, the Applicants wish to express their sincere appreciation to the Examiner for his courtesy and helpful suggestions made to the Applicants' representative during the personal interview.

Claim 1 has been amended as discussed during the interview to include the detailed description of preparation of the Composite Film and Elution Test set forth in the specification on pages 23-24.

In view of these amendments, the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is deemed to be overcome, as set forth in items 1 and 2 of the last Action.

Claim 1 has also been amended to limit the polyesters polyols contained in the laminate adhesive to only naphthalenedicarboxylic acid and optionally dimer acid and/or phthalic acid. This limitation is effected by defining the laminate adhesive as consisting essentially of a polyisocyanate component and a polyol component consisting essentially of polyester polyol. Furthermore, the polyester polyol is defined as consisting essentially of an acid component and a polyhydric alcohol, wherein the acid component consists of naphthalenedicarboxylic acid and optionally a dimer acid and/or phthalic acid. The term "consisting essentially of" means that the claim is open to include other ingredients so long as they do not effect the basic and novel properties of the claimed invention. The foregoing claim language excludes other types of polyester polyols such as component (A) in the composition of the Goto et al. reference. As described in the specification, the claimed laminate adhesive is superior to the adhesive of Goto et al., because of the limitation of the polyester polyols contained in the adhesive which remarkably reduce the concentration of cyclic ester compounds eluted by the adhesive through the composite film.

Lastly, claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Goto et al.

The Applicants are planning comparative experiments commensurate with the scope of the instant claims, to distinguish the claimed adhesive over the adhesive of Goto et al. The

composition of Example 1 of Goto et al. will be compared with the claimed adhesive, demonstrating that the composition of Goto et al. does not satisfy the cyclic ester compound elution required by claim 1.

Due to the length of time need to produce the adhesive of Goto et al. and conduct the comparative experiments, a petition for a six month suspension of time is concurrently presented.

Favorable action on the merits solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Shigetoshi SASANO et al.

By: Warren M. Cheek, Jr.
Warren M. Cheek, Jr.
Registration No. 33,367
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/dlk
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 8, 2003